



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/743,158

12/22/2003

Einat Amitay

IL920030045US1

7754

7590 07/31/2009  
Stephen C. Kaufman  
Intellectual Property Law Dept.  
IBM Corporation  
P.O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

EXAMINER

PHAM, MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/31/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/743,158	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AMITAY, EINAT	
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL PHAM	<b>Art Unit</b> 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 37-45 and 56-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 37-45 and 56-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**Detailed Action**

***Status of claims***

1. Claims 37-45 and 56-63 are pending.
2. Claims 37-45 and 56-63 have been examined.

***Specification***

3. Prior objection is withdrawn. The new title "Search Engine for Enhanced Web Index" is acknowledged.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. Prior Rejection under 112 second paragraph is withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 37-45, and 56-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0091671 by Prokoph (hereafter Prokoph)**

Art Unit: 2167

**further in view of U.S. Patent 6571239 by Cole et. al. (hereafter Cole) and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0208482 by Kim et. al. (hereafter Kim).**

**Claim 37 :**

Prokoph discloses the following claimed limitations:

“receiving user queries;”[0034 lines9-12, the search service 200 is coupled to indexer 206, which allows the client to issue search queries 212 against the search index 207.

Accordingly, receiving user queries (client to issue search queries).]

“searching an enhanced web index of documents with user queries; and”[ 0034 lines9-12, the search service 200 is coupled to indexer 206, which allows the client to issue search queries 212 against the search index 207. 0034 lines 2-6, an indexer 206 is coupled to the temporary document store 205 and decomposes the document extract 210 into a set of tokens, e.g. words, keywords, that are then stored together with their positional information in a search index 207. Accordingly, searching an index of documents (207) with user queries (212).]

Prokoph further discloses an “enhanced web index” (figures 2 element 207)

Prokoph further discloses “wherein said enhanced web index contains document information and text, metadata” [Prokoph 0034, indexer 206 is coupled to the temporary document store 205 and decomposes the document extract 210 into a set of tokens, e.g. words, keywords, that are stored together with their positional information in a search index 207, which forms the basis for the actual search engine. Accordingly disclosing “wherein said enhanced web index” (search index)

“includes at least document information” (words) “and text” (keywords) “, metadata.” (together with their positional information)

]

Prokoph does not explicitly disclose "adding information from at least some of said user queries to said index"

On the other hand, Cole discloses this in figure 2 elements 201, 245, 250, and 255. Col. 4 lines 63-67-Col. 5 lines 1-2, if the user enters a response which indicates satisfaction, the first query stored is parsed into keywords. Each keyword is associated with an object, and optionally, statistics of date usage are updated for each association. Under Alternative A, the Master Index is updated with theses associations directly.

Accordingly, disclosing adding information (parsed keywords) from at least some of said user queries (first query) to said index (index).

Both Prokoph and Cole are within applicant's same field of endeavor as applicant's invention. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to have applied the disclosure above of Cole to the disclosure of Prokoph for the purpose of keeping the index provided in Prokoph updated with current usage of query terms. Thereby improving Prokoph's system. In other words, Prokoph discloses indices that associate keywords or terms with documents or other objects, this is recognized by Cole, on col. 1 lines 16-18. Therefore, by

Art Unit: 2167

updating the keywords in an index with words from queries, it alleviates the problem of queries provided by an audience of users that change due to current events, changing fashion, etc.

However, Prokoph and Cole do not explicitly disclose an index including "anchor text".

On the other hand, Kim discloses 0029, indexer 26 extracts the anchor text from the anchor text and link database 24 parses the keywords from the web page database 14 and generates an indexed database. Accordingly, an index (indexed database) including anchor text (anchor text).

Prokoph, Cole, and Kim all are directed to indexing systems for searching for electronic documents. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to have applied Kim's disclosure to the combination of Prokoph and Cole for the purpose of providing more relevant searches by providing more relevant indices. Kim 0014 discloses inbound links to a page help to assess the importance of the page. Because some of the inbound links originate from authors other than the one who wrote the page being considered, they tend to give a more objective measure of the quality or importance of the pages. By making a link to other page, the author of the originating link endorses the destination page.

**Claim 38 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole "wherein said adding comprises associating queries with documents retrieved by a search engine." [ Figure 1. col. 3 lines 8-9, the queries are passed to a receiver 105. Col. 3 lines 15-19, Under Alternative A, the receiver passes

Art Unit: 2167

the query to a search Engine which matches the query against the (modified) keyword Index.

The keywords in the keyword index are associated with one or more objects in the repository.

Accordingly, wherein said adding comprises associating queries (queries/keywords) with documents (objects) retrieved by a search engine (search engine)]

**Claim 39 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole “wherein said associating comprises determining which of said retrieved documents to associate with said queries and determining which queries to associate with said retrieved documents.”[ Col. 1 lines 20-24, if the query matches one or more keywords in the index, the data objects associated with those keywords, or a description of these objects, such as a hitlist of titles, thumbnails, etc. , are retrieved from the repository and returned to the search engine. Accordingly, wherein said associating comprises determining which of said retrieved documents (objects) to associate with said queries (queries/keywords) and determining which queries (queries/keywords) to associate with said retrieved documents (objects).]

**Claim 40 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole “wherein said adding comprises listing a term in a query and the number of times that term is associated with a document.” [Col. 4 lines 63-67-Col. 5 lines 1-2, if the user enters a response which indicates satisfaction, the first query stored is parsed into keywords. Each keyword is associated with an object, and optionally, statistics of date usage are updated for each association. Under Alternative A, the Master Index

Art Unit: 2167

is updated with theses associations directly. Col. 4 lines 18-20, how long to keep associations between keywords and data objects either in the master keyword index in alternative A or in the auxiliary index in alternative B. Accordingly, wherein said adding comprises listing a term in a query (master Index is updated with theses associations) and the number of times (how long to keep) that term (keyword) is associated with a document (associations between keywords and data objects)]

**Claim 41 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole “wherein said adding comprises ranking queries associated to documents.” [Col. 4 lines 63-67-Col. 5 lines 1-2, if the user enters a response which indicates satisfaction, the first query stored is parsed into keywords. Each keyword is associated with an object, and optionally, statistics of date usage are updated for each association. Under Alternative A, the Master Index is updated with theses associations directly. Col. 4 lines 18-20, how long to keep associations between keywords and data objects either in the master keyword index in alternative A or in the auxiliary index in alternative B. Accordingly, wherein said adding (index updated) comprises ranking queries associated to documents (sorts associations)]

**Claim 42 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole “wherein said ranking comprises ranking said queries according to frequency of usage.”[Col. 4 lines 23-25, sorts associations from oldest to newest and from lowest to highest frequency. Accordingly, ranking comprises ranking



Art Unit: 2167

said queries (sorts associations) according to frequency of usage (frequency of usage)]

**Claim 43 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole “wherein said ranking comprises ranking said queries according to time of usage.” [Col. 4 lines 23-25, sorts associations from oldest to newest and from lowest to highest frequency. Accordingly, wherein said ranking comprises ranking said queries (sorts associations) according to time of usage (oldest to newest)]

**Claim 44 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole “wherein said adding comprises updating said index with at least some of said ranked queries.” [Col. 4 lines 23-25, sorts associations from oldest to newest and from lowest to highest frequency. Col. 4 lines 44-45, associations are then added to either the master Index. Accordingly, wherein said adding comprises updating said index (associations are then added to either the master Index) with at least some of said ranked queries (sorts associations)]

**Claim 45 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole “wherein said updating comprises filtering out lowly ranked queries.” [Col. 4 lines 50-51, if yes, the most deletable association is deleted to make room. Accordingly, wherein said updating comprises filtering out lowly ranked queries (the most deletable association is deleted)]

Art Unit: 2167

**Claim 56 :**

Prokoph discloses the following claimed limitations:

"receiving user queries;" [0034 lines9-12, the search service 200 is coupled to indexer 206, which allows the client to issue search queries 212 against the search index 207.

Accordingly, receiving user queries (client to issue search queries).]

"searching an enhanced web index of documents with said user queries;" [ 0034 lines9-12, the search service 200 is coupled to indexer 206, which allows the client to issue search queries 212 against the search index 207. 0034 lines 2-6, an indexer 206 is coupled to the temporary document store 205 and decomposes the document extract 210 into a set of tokens, e.g. words, keywords, that are then stored together with their positional information in a search index 207. Accordingly, searching an enhanced web index of documents (207) with user queries (212).]

"associating terms in said user queries with documents said terms were used to retrieve; and"[ 0034 lines9-12, the search service 200 is coupled to indexer 206, which allows the client to issue search queries 212 against the search index 207. 0034 lines 2-6, an indexer 206 is coupled to the temporary document store 205 and decomposes the document extract 210 into a set of tokens, e.g. words, keywords, that are then stored together with their positional information in a search index 207. Accordingly, associating (issue search queries against the search index) terms in said user queries (client issues search query) with documents (documents) said terms were used to retrieve (issue search queries against the search index)]

Prokoph further discloses “wherein said enhanced web index containing document information and text, metadata” [Prokoph 0034, indexer 206 is coupled to the temporary document store 205 and decomposes the document extract 210 into a set of tokens, e.g. words, keywords, that are stored together with their positional information in a search index 207, which forms the basis for the actual search engine. Accordingly disclosing “wherein said enhanced web index” (search index) “containing document information” (words) “and text” (keywords) “, metadata.” (together with their positional information).]

Prokoph does not explicitly disclose “adding said terms to an index with which said documents were retrieved.”

On the other hand, Cole discloses this in figure 2 elements 201, 245, 250, and 255. Col. 4 lines 63-67-Col. 5 lines 1-2, if the user enters a response which indicates satisfaction, the first query stored is parsed into keywords. Each keyword is associated with an object, and optionally, statistics of date usage are updated for each association. Under Alternative A, the Master Index is updated with theses associations directly.

Accordingly, disclosing adding said terms (keywords) to an index (index) with which said documents were retrieved (object).

Both Prokoph and Cole are within applicant’s same field of endeavor as applicant’s invention. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to have applied the disclosure above of Cole to the disclosure of Prokoph for the purpose of keeping the index provided in Prokoph updated with current usage of query terms. Thereby improving Prokoph's system. In other words, Prokoph discloses indices that associate keywords or terms with documents or other objects, this is recognized by Cole, on col. 1 lines 16-18. Therefore, by

Art Unit: 2167

updating the keywords in an index with words from queries, it alleviates the problem of queries provided by an audience of users that change due to current events, changing fashion, etc.

However, the combination of Prokoph and Cole do not explicitly disclose wherein the index includes "anchor text".

On the other hand, Kim discloses indexer 26 extracts the anchor text from the anchor text and link database 24 parses the keywords from the web page database 14 and generates an indexed database. Accordingly, an index (indexed database) including anchor text (anchor text).

Prokoph, Cole, and Kim all are directed to indexing systems for searching for electronic documents. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to have applied Kim's disclosure to the combination of Prokoph and Cole for the purpose of providing more relevant searches by providing more relevant indices. Kim 0014 discloses inbound links to a page help to assess the importance of the page. Because some of the inbound links originate from authors other than the one who wrote the page being considered, they tend to give a more objective measure of the quality or importance of the pages. By making a link to other page, the author of the originating link endorses the destination page.

**Claim 57 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Prokoph "indicating how frequently said terms occurred in said documents" [0012, number of occurrences of each search

Art Unit: 2167

term is determined. Accordingly, indicating how frequently (number of occurrences) said terms (term) occurred in said documents (document). ]

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole, col. 4 lines 15-17, number of sessions associated with keywords, to indicate the frequency of use. Accordingly, disclosing indicating how frequently (frequency) said terms (keywords) occurred in user queries (sessions).

Prokoph, Cole, and Kim are within applicant's same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to have applied the disclosure above of Cole to the disclosure of Prokoph and Kim for the purpose of keeping the index updated with current usage of query terms. As recognized by Cole, on col. 1 lines 54-58. Therefore, by updating the keyword index with words from queries, it alleviates the problem of queries provided by an audience of users that change due to current events, changing fashion, etc.

**Claim 58 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole "wherein said user queries comprise a portion of the queries used in a session to find a selected document"[ Figure 2 and col. 4 lines 15-17, number of sessions associated with keywords, to indicate the frequency of use. Accordingly, wherein said user queries (query) comprise a portion of the queries used in a session (matched keywords) to find a selected document (object)]

**Claim 59 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole "wherein said user queries comprise a first query of a session to find a selected document"[ Figure 2 and col. 4 lines 15-17,

Art Unit: 2167

number of sessions associated with keywords, to indicate the frequency of use. Accordingly, wherein said user queries (query/keyword) comprise a first query (first query) of a session (session) to find a selected document (object)]

**Claim 60 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole “wherein a document associated with a query comprises the document selected by said user”[ col. 3 lines 49-51, the end of a session can also be explicitly indicated by a user response, in which the user marks objects as relevant or irrelevant at the user interface. Accordingly, wherein a document (object) associated with a query (query) comprises the document selected by said user (user marks objects)]

**Claim 61 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Cole “wherein a document associated with a query comprises the document browsed to by said user as a result of a query”[ col. 3 lines 49-51, the end of a session can also be explicitly indicated by a user response, in which the user marks objects as relevant or irrelevant at the user interface. Accordingly, wherein a document (object) associated with a query (query) comprises the document browsed to by said user as a result of a query (user marks objects)]

**Claim 62 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim disclose in Prokoph “wherein documents associated with a query comprise the higher ranked documents produced from a query.”[0008, wherein

Art Unit: 2167

documents (documents) associated with a query (query) comprise the higher ranked documents (documents on a result list can be scored in an order which represents their relevance to the query... "relevancy ranking") produced from a query (query).]

**7. Claims 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0091671 by Prokoph (hereafter Prokoph) and U.S. Patent 6571239 by Cole et. al. (hereafter Cole), U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0208482 by Kim et. al. (hereafter Kim) further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0261021 by Mittal et. al. (hereafter Mittal).**

**Claim 63 :**

The combination of Prokoph, Cole, and Kim do not explicitly disclose "wherein said user queries are in a language other than the language of a selected document"

On the other hand, Mittal discloses, abstract, queries can be expressed using character sets and/or languages that are different from the character set and/or language of at least some of the data that is to be searched. Accordingly, wherein said user queries (queries) are in a language (using language) other than the language of a selected document (languages that are different from the language of at least some of the data that is searched) is disclosed.

Prokoph, Cole, Kim and Mittal are all directed towards document search and therefore all are within the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Mittal's disclosure above to the combination of Prokoph and Cole for the purpose of allowing various

Art Unit: 2167

devices to utilize the benefits of the search indices. Devices such as mobile phones would be too tedious for query entry, and further typing in different languages using an ASCII keyboard also would be tedious and slow see 0006 and 0018 of Mittal. Accordingly, by allowing different languages to be entered in as queries, it allows for an improvement in the over all search process.

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 37-45 and 56-63 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's assert the following with regard to the cited references.

**A. Applicant's cite paragraph 6 of Prokoph teaches away because "it is very clear that not only does Prokoph not search web indices, but it is also clear he does not even want to deal with them". That Prokoph does not teach web indices so he obviously does not teach searching them or updating them. Further citing paragraph 9 of Prokoph that Prokoph explains why searching web indices is inadequate in his opinion. That Prokoph paragraph 30 does not use a web index. That Prokoph does not disclose a web index since metadata and anchor text obviously are not being considered or included by prokoph. In sum, Applicant's assert that Prokoph does not disclose a web index and that the web index does not contain an anchor text.**

*In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on*



Art Unit: 2167

*combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). It was stated in the rejection that Prokoph disclosed a web index. And further an enhanced web index. And that Prokoph merely did not disclose an index that contained anchor text. However, it was stated in the rejection that Kim disclosed this. Both Prokoph and Kim are analogous and within the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention. They are therefore combinable.*

*In regards to Prokoph teaches away, this is disagreed. Prokoph discloses abstract, the method system and computer readable medium of the present invention includes retrieving a document to be indexed. It is further disagreed that Prokoph does not teach a web index. Prokoph does teach web indices as cited above in the rejection, and furthermore, merely disclosing past inadequacies of past web index systems does not mean the prior art teaches away when Prokoph further discusses how to improve web indexes. Prokoph discloses that the web index comprises metadata, as seen above in the rejection. Prokoph merely did not disclose anchor text being indexed. Kim was utilized to disclose that anchor text is indexed. The rejection is therefore maintained.*

**B. Applicant's assert that Cole does not deal with adding information to a web index. Stating that Cole is working with a keyword index as opposed to a web index. Stating that when it says "the present invention provides a method...to modify the associations between objects and keywords in the index, based on keywords supplied by the**

Art Unit: 2167

**user during a search session", it means that the keyword index is changing. That nowhere does Cole teach or suggest that a web index itself is modified. That Repository 115, in Cole is referring to what applicant's call the document index. That instead of adding the query words to it, Cole is adding the query words to his keyword list in his search engine.**

**Accordingly applicant's state that it is clear that Cole does not teach or suggest "adding information from at least some of said user queries to said enhanced web index." That Cole adds nothing to the document index and certainly not a web index. That Cole nowhere mentions that a web index is updated or modified based on queries. That Cole teaches a master Index or Auxiliary Index is updated but nowhere teaches or suggests that the document index should be updated. In sum, Applicant's assert that Cole does not teach "adding information from at least some of the users queries to said enhanced web index" because Cole is directed to a keyword index and not a web index.**

*In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Prokoph disclosed the web index, and is further updated/enhanced by indexing documents. Prokoph merely did not disclose updating an index with information from user queries and the index having anchor text. The anchor text being indexed was disclosed by Kim, and Cole disclosed that an index is updated using information from user queries. All are within the same field of endeavor as applicant's*

*invention as they are all search systems utilizing indices, they are therefore analogous and combinable.*

*In regards applicant's assertions directed towards Cole. Cole disclosed that the user queries are used to update an index. In arguing that Cole does not disclose a web index and instead discloses a keyword index, applicant's essentially further assert that Cole is thus non-analogous. However, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Prokoph, Cole, and Kim are within the same field of endeavor as they are both search engines requiring index systems. Cole is further reasonably pertinent to the particular problem at hand, which is to add information from at least some of said user queries to an index. Accordingly, applicant's assertions in regards to the prior art are not persuasive.*

**C. In summary, Prokoph does not disclose or suggest searching a web index and does not mention updating any document index, let alone a web index, based on words used in a query. Cole also makes no mention of web indices and discusses only updating the keyword indices. That there is no teaching or suggestion of updating any document index, let alone a web index based on words used in a query. That only a keyword index is updated, but not any document index.**

Art Unit: 2167

*In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Prokoph disclosed searching a web index and updating the web index by indexing documents. Cole disclosed updating an index based on words used in a query. And Kim disclosed a web index that stores an anchor text. The cited references are combinable as they are all within the same field of endeavor. The rejection is therefore maintained.*

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record listed on PTO-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Pham whose telephone number is (571)272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. P./

Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/John R. Cottingham/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit  
2167

Application/Control Number: 10/743,158  
Art Unit: 2167

Page 22